

ANNUAL AIR MONITORING NETWORK PLAN CHECKLIST

(Updated 1/2/2013)

Year:

Agency:

40 CFR 58.10(a)(1) requires that each ANP include information regarding the following types of monitors: SLAMS monitoring stations including FRM, FEM, and ARM monitors that are part of SLAMS, NCore stations, STN stations, State speciation stations, SPM stations, and/or, in serious, severe and extreme ozone nonattainment areas, PAMS stations, and SPM monitoring stations.

40 CFR 58.10(a)(1) further directs that, “The plan shall include a statement of purposes for each monitor and evidence that siting and operation of each monitor meets the requirements of appendices A, C, D, and E of this part, where applicable.” On this basis, review of the ANPs is based on the requirements listed in 58.10 along with those in Appendices A, C, D, and E.

EPA R9 will not take action to approve or disapprove any item for which Part 58 grants approval authority to the Administrator rather than the Regional Administrators, but we will do a check to see if the required information is included and correct. The items requiring approval by the Administrator are: PAMS, NCore, Speciation (STN/CSN), and NO2 requirements including near road, area-wide, and RA40.

Please note that this checklist summarizes many of the requirements of 40 CFR Part 58, but does not substitute for those requirements, nor do its contents provide a binding determination of compliance with those requirements. The checklist is subject to revision in the future and we welcome comments on its contents and structure.

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58	Was the info submitted? ¹ If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect ² ?	Does the information provided ³ meet the req? ⁴	Notes
1.	Submit plan by July 1 st	58.10 (a)(1)			
2.	Statement of purpose for each monitor	58.10 (a)(1)		[Yes if correct info was submitted]	
3.	30-day public comment / inspection period	58.10 (a)(1), 58.10 (a)(2)			

¹ Response options: NA (Not Applicable), Yes, No, Incomplete, Incorrect. The responses “Incomplete” and “Incorrect” assume that some information has been provided.

² To the best of our knowledge.

³ Assuming the information is correct

⁴ Response options: NA (Not Applicable) – [reason], Yes, No, Insufficient to Judge.

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58	Was the info submitted? ¹ If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect ² ?	Does the information provided ³ meet the req? ⁴	Notes
4.	Modifications to SLAMS network – case when we are not approving actual system modifications (i.e., we will do it outside the ANP process ⁵)	58.10 (a)(2) 58.10(e)		[Yes if correct info was submitted]	
5.	Modifications to SLAMS network – case when we are approving actual system modifications per 58.14(c)	58.10 (a)(2) 58.10 (b)(5) 58.10(e) 58.14 (c)		[Yes if correct info was submitted and 58.14(c) has been met]	
6.	Does plan include documentation (e.g., attached approval letter) for system modifications that have been approved since last ANP approval?			[Yes if correct info was submitted]	
7.	NCore plan submitted to Admin. by 7/1/2009	58.10 (a)(3)		NA – HQ app.	
8.	NCore site operational (by 1/1/2011)	58.10 (a)(3)			
9.	Pb plan for ≥1.0 tpy sources submitted by 7/1/2009	58.10 (a)(4)			
10.	Pb site for ≥1.0 tpy sources operational by 1/1/2010	58.10 (a)(4)			
11.	Pb plan for 0.5-1.0 tpy submitted by 7/1/2011	58.10 (a)(4)			
12.	Pb site for 0.5-1.0 tpy sources operational (by 12/27/2011)	58.10 (a)(4)			
13.	NO2 plan for area-wide and RA40 sites submitted by 7/1/2012	58.10 (a)(5)		NA – HQ app.	
14.	NO2 area-wide and RA40 sites operational by 1/1/2013	58.10 (a)(5)			
15.	NO2 plan for near-road sites submitted by 7/1/2012	58.10 (a)(5)	[NA if near-road sites not req; likely “Incomplete” for all others for 2012 plans]	NA – HQ app.	
16.	NO2 near-road sites operational by ? (N/A until 2013 or 2014 plans)	58.10 (a)(5)			
17.	SO2 plan for PWEI sites submitted by 2011	58.10 (a)(6)			
18.	SO2 sites operational (by 1/1/2013)	58.10 (a)(6) and 58.13(d)			
19.	CO plan for 2015 near-road sites submitted by 7/1/2014	58.10 (a)(7) and 58.13(e)(1)			
20.	CO sites for first phase of CO monitors operational	58.10 (a)(7)			

Comment [mk1]: Previous req.

Comment [mk2]: Previous req.

Comment [mk3]: Future req.

Comment [mk4]: Future req.

Comment [mk5]: Previous req.

⁵ See 58.14(c)

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58	Was the info submitted? ¹ If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect ² ?	Does the information provided ³ meet the req? ⁴	Notes
	(by 1/1/2015)	and 58.13(e)(1)			
21.	CO plan for 2017 near-road sites by 7/1/2016	58.10 (a)(7) and 58.13(e)(2)			
22.	CO sites for first phase of CO monitors operational (by 1/1/2017)	58.10 (a)(7) and 58.13(e)(2)			
23.	AQS site identification number for each site	58.10 (b)(1)		[Yes if correct info was submitted]	
24.	Location of each site: street address and geographic coordinates	58.10 (b)(2)		[Yes if correct info was submitted]	
25.	Sampling and analysis method(s) for each measured parameter	58.10 (b)(3)			
26.	Operating schedule for each monitor (see items 62-66)	58.10 (b)(4)			
27.	Any proposals to remove or move a monitoring station within a period of 18 months following plan submittal	58.10 (b)(5)		[Yes if correct info was submitted, (assumes we are not approving the changes in ANP)]	
28.	Scale of representativeness for each monitor as defined in Appendix D	58.10(b)(6); App D			
29.	Identification of sites suitable and sites not suitable for comparison to the annual PM2.5 NAAQS as described in Part 58.30	58.10 (b)(7)			
30.	MSA, CBSA, CSA or other area represented by the monitor	58.10 (b)(8)		[Yes if correct info was submitted]	
31.	Designation of any Pb monitors as either source-oriented or non-source-oriented	58.10 (b)(9)		[Yes if correct info was submitted]	
32.	Any source-oriented Pb site for which a waiver has been granted by EPA RA	58.10 (b)(10)		[Yes if correct info was submitted]	
33.	Any Pb monitor for which a waiver has been requested or granted by EPA RA for use of Pb-PM10 in lieu of Pb-TSP	58.10 (b)(11)		[Yes if correct info was submitted]	
34.	Identification of required NO2 monitors as either near-road or area-wide	58.10 (b)(12)			
35.	Document how states and local agencies provide for	58.10 (c)		[Yes if correct info	

Comment [mk6]: Future req.

Comment [mk7]: Take out for 2013 and later plans since it is duplicative with items 62-66.

Comment [mk8]: Future req. (2013)

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58	Was the info submitted? ¹ If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect ² ?	Does the information provided ³ meet the req? ⁴	Notes
	the review of changes to a PM2.5 monitoring network that impact the location of a violating PM2.5 monitor. ⁶			was submitted]	
36.	Plan to modify the network that complies with findings of the 5-year network assessment. [Note: recommended to be submitted on year of network assessment or year after.]	58.10 (e) 58.14 (a)	Only applies to year of or after 5-year network assessment	[Yes if plan was submitted, either with ANP or separately]	
37.	Precision/Accuracy reports submitted to AQS	58.16(a); App A, 1.3 and 5.1.1			
38.	Annual data certification submitted	58.15 App. A 1.3			
39.	Frequency of flow rate verification for manual PM samplers audit	App A 3.3.2			
40.	Frequency of flow rate verification for automated PM analyzers audit	App A 3.2.3			
41.	Frequency of one-point flow rate verification for Pb samplers audit	App A 3.3.4.1			
42.	Frequency of one-point QC check (gaseous)	App. A 3.2.1			
43.	Date of last Annual Performance Evaluation (gaseous)	App. A 3.2.2			
44.	Dates of last two semi-annual flow rate audits for PM monitors	App A, 3.2.4 and 3.3.3			
45.	Dates of last two semi-annual flow rate audits for Pb monitors	App A 3.3.4.1			
46.	PM2.5 co-location	App A 3.2.5			
47.	Distance between co-located monitors	App. A 3.2.5.6			
48.	Manual PM10 method co-location met? (note: continuous PM10 does not have this requirement)	App A 3.3.1			
49.	Pb co-location	App A 3.3.4.3			
50.	PM10-2.5 co-location (note: only applies to Fresno and Phoenix NCore sites)	App A 3.3.6			
51.	Required # of PM2.5 PEP audits	App A 3.2.7		Yes - EPA	

Comment [mk9]: Future req. (2015-2016)

⁶ The affected state or local agency must document the process for obtaining public comment and include any comments received through the public notification process within their submitted plan.

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58	Was the info submitted? ¹ If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect ² ?	Does the information provided ³ meet the req? ⁴	Notes
				requirement	
52.	Required # of Pb PEP audits	App A 3.3.4.4		Yes - EPA requirement ⁸	
53.	Required # of NPAP audits (or approved equivalent)	App A 2.4		Yes - EPA requirement ⁹	
54.	Instrument/monitoring method code for each monitor: is it reported properly? Is it reported correctly (i.e., appropriate method code for regulatory monitors)?	App C 2.4.1.2			
55.	Placeholder for: Optional request to have PM2.5 continuous instruments treated as non-FEMs and therefore not comparable to NAAQS?	Proposed rule and memo			
56.	Start date for each monitor	Required to determine if other req. (e.g., min # and co-lo) are met		[Yes if correct info was submitted]	
57.	Instrument monitor type for each monitor	Required to determine if other req. (e.g., min # and co-lo) are met		[Yes if correct info was submitted]	
58.	Monitoring objective for each instrument	App D 1.1 58.10 (b)(6)		[Yes if correct info was submitted]	
59.	Site type for each instrument	App D 1.1.1		[Yes if correct info was submitted]	
60.	Instrument parameter code for each instrument	Required to determine if other req. (e.g., min # and co-lo) are met		[Yes if correct info was submitted]	

Comment [mk10]: EPQ req.

Comment [mk11]: Future req.

⁷ EPA has reviewed EPA documentation to confirm that these requirements have been met for the area in question.

⁸ EPA has reviewed EPA documentation to confirm that these requirements have been met for the area in question.

⁹ EPA has reviewed EPA documentation to confirm that these requirements have been met for the area in question.

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58	Was the info submitted? ¹ If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect? ²	Does the information provided ³ meet the req? ⁴	Notes
61.	Instrument parameter occurrence code for each instrument	Required to determine if other req. (e.g., min # and co-lo) are met		[Yes if correct info was submitted]	
62.	Sampling season for ozone (note: date of waiver approval must be included if the sampling season deviates from requirement)	App D, 4.1(i)			
63.	Sampling schedule for PM2.5 - applies to year-round and seasonal sampling schedules (note: date of waiver approval must be included if the sampling season deviates from requirement)	58.12(d) App D 4.7			
64.	Sampling schedule for PM10	58.12(e) App D 4.6			
65.	Sampling schedule for Pb	58.12(b) App D 4.5			
66.	Sampling schedule for PM10-2.5	58.12(f) App D 4.8			
67.	Minimum # of monitors for O3 [Note: should be supported by MSA ID, MSA population, DV, # monitors, and # required monitors]	App D, 4.1(a) and Table D-2			
68.	Identification of max. conc. O3 monitor(s)	App D 4.1 (b)			
69.	Minimum monitoring requirements met for near-road NO2	App D 4.3.2			
70.	Minimum monitoring requirements met for area-wide NO2	App D 4.3.3			
71.	Minimum monitoring requirements met for RA-40 NO2	App D 4.3.4			
72.	Minimum monitoring requirements met for SO2	App D 4.4			
73.	Minimum monitoring requirements met for CO	App D			
74.	Minimum monitoring requirements met for Pb	App D 4.5 58.13(a)			
75.	Minimum # of monitors for PM2.5 [Note: should be supported by MSA ID, MSA population, DV, # monitors, and # required monitors]	App D, 4.7.1(a) and Table D-5			
76.	Required PM2.5 sites represent community-wide air	App D			

Comment [mk12]: Future req. (2014, 2013, resp.).

Comment [mk13]: Future req.

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58	Was the info submitted? ¹ If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect ² ?	Does the information provided ³ meet the req? ⁴	Notes
	quality	4.7.1(b)			
77.	For PM2.5, is at least one site in a population-oriented area of expected maximum concentration	App D 4.7.1(b)(1)			
78.	If >1 SLAMS PM2.5 required, is there a site in an area of poor air quality	App D 4.7.1(b)(2)			
79.	Minimum monitoring requirements for continuous PM2.5	App D 4.7.2			
80.	Requirements for PM2.5 background and transport sites	App D 4.7.3			
81.	Are PM2.5 Chemical Speciation requirements met for official STN sites?	App D 4.7.4			
82.	Spatial Averaging for comparison to Annual NAAQS: are intended CMZs defined and met criteria in 40 CFR 50 App N?	App D 4.7.5			
83.	Minimum # of monitors for PM10	App D, 4.6 (a) and Table D-4			
84.	Minimum monitoring requirements met for PM10-2.5 mass and speciation	App D 4.8			
85.	Distance of site from nearest road	App E 6			
86.	Traffic count of nearest road	App E			
87.	Groundcover	App E 3(a)			
88.	Probe height	App E 2			
89.	Distance from supporting structure	App E 2			
90.	Distance from obstructions on roof	App E 4(b)			
91.	Distance from obstructions not on roof	App E 4(a)			
92.	Distance from trees	App E 5			
93.	Distance to furnace or incinerator flue	App E 3(b)			
94.	Unrestricted airflow	App E, 4(a) and 4(b)			
95.	Probe material (if applicable)	App E 9			
96.	Residence time (if applicable)	App E 9			
97.					
98.	Not required as part of plan but good to check				
99.	For SPMs listed as non-regulatory, note the start Date of FRM/FEM/ARM at SPM. If > 24 months, agency must supply information that App A, C or E	58.20(c) – (e)			

Comment [mk14]: Previous req.

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58	Was the info submitted? ¹ If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect ² ?	Does the information provided ³ meet the req? ⁴	Notes
	requirements were not met.				
100.					
101.					

Public Comments on Annual Network Plan

Were comments submitted to the S/L/T agency during the public comment period?

If no, skip the remaining questions.

If yes:

- Were any of the comments substantive?
 - If yes, which ones?
 - Explain basis for determination if any comments were considered not substantive:
- Did the agency respond to the substantive comments?
 - If yes, was the response adequate?
- Do the substantive comments require separate EPA response (i.e., agency response wasn't adequate)?
- Are the sections of the annual network plan that received substantive comments approvable after consideration of comments?
 - If yes, provide rationale: